

REMARKS

In the first Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Alivisatos et al. ('000) reference. The drawings have been accepted.

This Amendment amends claims 1-5 and cancels claims 6 and 7.

The foregoing amendments and following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action, and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102


Pending claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Alivisatos et al. ('000) reference.

Alivisatos et al. at col. 2, lines 7-10 states "It would be particularly advantageous if the light emitting material was an inorganic material capable of withstanding higher temperatures than the conventional organic polymeric materials." In contrast, claims 1-5 as amended call for "a nanomorphonic material layer having at least one non-polymeric organic compound". Clearly, Alivisatos et al. does not teach or suggest an organic material that is *non-polymeric*. Moreover, there is nothing in Alivisatos et al. that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to use an organic compound that is non-polymeric – particularly in view of the examples disclosed in Alivisatos et al.

Support for the amendment to claims 1-5 can be found, for example, in the application at page 8, line 19, – page 9, line 25, and page 11, lines 3-23. These portions of the application list examples of suitable non-polymeric organic compounds.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claims 1-5 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 45,287

William R. Zimmerli/tt
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 588-2758
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.